DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 139 EA 018 983

AUTHOR Davies, Lynn
TITLE Towards a Gender-Inclusive Theory of Educational Administration.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 16p.; In: The Professional Preparation and Development of Educational Administrators in Commonwealth Developing Areas. A Symposium (Barbados, August 26-30, 1985); see EA 018 975.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Education; Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Role; *Developing Nations; *Educational Administration; *Organizational Theories; *Sex Bias; Sex Differences; Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The overrepresentation of men in educational administration may be a result of inappropriate attempts to replicate in education the organizational structures of noneducational enterprises rather than a result of women's interests in or capabilities for administration. This paper opens with a description of the "critical theory" of educational administration that is increasingly challenging the suitability of applying concepts of scientific management to education. Although it may be too late to avoid the application to education in Western societies of organizational theories developed through the study of male-dominated organizations within the larger male-dominated society, it may be possible to prevent their inappropriate application--and the consequent masculinization of educational administration--in the Third World. The paper next reports on a research effort to determine the gender-related attitudes of men and women educators in developing countries. The need to characterize sex-related differences neutrally is emphasized. The paper then considers the criteria that would be appropriate to an unbiased management model and proposes a holistic model that meets the criteria. The model supports training all teachers for management and suggests accounting for the manager's life off the job. (PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. G. Marshall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED276139

TOWARDS A GENDER--INCLUSIVE THEORY OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

by

Lynn Davies
University of Birmingham

EA 018 983

It is an irony that educational administration, as a practice, is not at all educational. It teaches nothing to those being administered, except perhaps the strategies for countering control and the devices for manipulating the managers. More significantly, for the purposes of this paper, it teaches us very little about the underrepresentation of certain groups such as women in the senior management of schools throughout many parts of the world. Concerns about equality have certainly been voiced of late; but the emphasis has been on "getting more women into management," or "helping women to reach the top." This paper will argue that gender imbalances in school management should provoke a fundamental critique of the concept or practice of educational administration itself, rather than focus on the shortcomings and biases of individual women--or men--as they operate within a given system.

There is a parallel here with the concerns about female underachievement and wastage in school. Programmes to channel more girls into science and technology revealed the need for a deeper examination of the abstract and dehumanised notion of "science" as we conceive it in our curricula. If girls do not like science, do we change girls or do we redefine "science?" Similarly, if women do not strive for senior positions in schools, do we remould women or do we begin to question the hierarchically ordered and increasingly technicist notions that we have of "educational administration?" By developing a critical theory of educational administration as it relates to gender, and by presenting some preliminary findings from a research project on women in educational administration in the Third World, this paper attempts to suggest alternative models for school management which would challenge any pressure to change potential female administrators into substitute males.

Conflict and Critical Theories

A conflict of perspective on educational administration seeks to trace the different access to resources such as power that particular groups in organisations have, and to identify in whose real interests an institution operates. It asks what ideological, financial and emotional mechanisms are used in the distribution of scarce resources, and how power inequalities become legitimised - either within a school, or between a school and its paymasters.

Within a conflict perspective, there is a growing body of analysis derived from the Frankfurt School which is developing a radical "critical theory" of educational administration. Starting from a concern with social class inequality and the dilemmas of the modern State, writers such as Bates (1982,1983), Giroux (1983) and Watkins (1983), have traced the transfer of scientific management from industrial corporations to school organisation, and have revealed educational administration as a technology of control and a legitimator of repression. Through its emphasis on "efficiency," on "rationality," on "performance targets," and through a mystification of the expert management process, the growth of scientific management is seen as a means to increase control over workers--in this case teachers. Work tasks are fragmented and the decision-making capacity of the worker/teacher is reduced. By presenting school organisational problems as technical problems, "it ignores the power relationships, class structure and legitimating ideologies around which organisations are structures" (Watkins, 1983).

The traditional idea of the charismatic headteacher relying on personality, relationships and teaching experience is being replaced by the notion of the specially trained management stylist who will raise standards (targets) and rationalise the personnel's efforts through specific and expert "techniques." Administrative issues become separated from the educational issues, and the language of the machine replaces the negotiative communication of the responsible individual. Systems approaches, cybernetics and feedback loops are the metaphors which provide "uncontestable descriptions of the way things are" (Bates, 1982) and obscure the interests of the dominating techno-administrative elite. The current language of administrative discourse--accountability, cost-effectiveness and staff rationalisation--"ties education to the corporate sector regardless of the continuing stratification and inequalities that exist" (Watkins, 1983).

With regard to developing countries, the cult of the "expert" and the institutionalism of the "scientific" may not have had so much impact as in the West (certainly few of the Heads in our survey had received management training). There is therefore a sense of urgency--before the Taylorism revival spreads its net--in realising that there may be other forms of educational organisation than the industrial, top-down and technicist models.

Clearly, newer phenomenological approaches to school organisation have gained ground over the last decade (Greenfield, 1973, 1978), but it has been argued that British and American educational administration still lacks a firm social science foundation. Questions of the social class, age, gender or ethnic group of the "members" of school organisations have rarely been raised in terms of their own staff interaction, rather in terms of the pupil or student and the effectiveness of learning. "It is almost as if there is an assumption that anything that is good for the client must be good for the staff" (Tipton, 1985). In current educational administration there is a

> reliance on psychology and social psychology, and ignorance or fear of European sociology and political science, party politics and the labour movement. The first manifests itself in a preponderance of writing on leadership characteristics and effectiveness (perhaps through 'participation') and small-group behaviour in organisations. The second in a preference for the politically uncomplicating framework of systems theory.

Tipton goes on to argue for a study of educational institutions as <u>workplaces</u>, looking at orientations to employment and at the design of work--relatively well-developed themes in the sociology of work, but not in the sociology of the school. Classic studies of car workers' attitudes to their job and to the organisational setting have yet to be replicated in schools; we know little of the social circumstances and out-of-work activities of teachers. Yet given that in many countries these employees will more often than not be women, it is strange that an unexplored dimension is their important outside work identities--as housewife, mother or daughter or aging parents and in-laws.

Gender and Management

There is also an urgency in rethinking our scope of analysis when we consider that the participation of women in educational administration may become more rather than less limited. In the UK, for example, we see a decline in the number of women Heads. The spread of co-education, the rationalisation of comprehensive schools and the growth of the business-oriented management ethic have all combined to project men as increasingly more suitable for the running of large-scale organisations. It might well be that men teachers in the Third World will also appropriate the image of the high-tech Principal, to the exlusion of women (in the same way that agricultural technology was often appropriated by, or aimed at, men--in spite of women being the main agricultural producers in many countries).

Critical theorists have traditionally been concerned with class domination rather than gender domination because of their reliance on the language of Marxist scholars. Yet exploration of the interests and power differentials of other social groupings leads to similar conclusions and avenues of critique. How is it that women have come to be excluded from "efficient", "rational" and "scientific" management? While many developing countries do suspect Western models of "rationality" and analyse them as a means to perpetuate dependency, there needs to be a recognition that such models are not gender-neutral either, but were conceived by men and carry unexplicated masculinist biases.

A classic example of this is of "leadership." Intriligator (1983) has done a wonderful demolition job on the Great Man and classical leadership theories:

> Assuming that leadership theory is formed by and has impact on the culture in which it exists, it is not surprising that traditional leadership theory was proposed for, researched on and normed on male leaders in male-oriented institutions.... Because theories are systems for organizing past and future experience, their value is two-fold: they provide a way to pattern or understand what happened in the past, and they help us predict what will happen in the future. We create worlds reifying experience in theories. Leadership theory potentially frames the way that money, status and power to change are distributed or not distributed. By definition, leaders have their hands on the levers that move the world. Leadership theory that assumes a male perspective, or theory in which male values are so deeply embedded as to be invisible, ensures that only males, or women adopting male views, will be selected as leaders, will continue to lead and thereby set courses, define visions and create new worlds. The current realities of organizational life make this situation untenable.

Intriligator goes on to analyse the male bias by which leadership "traits" were identified, and discusses the alternative impact of the behavioural and contingency theorists. She suggests that social exchange theories are, in fact, the most relevant for the acknowledgement of gender issues in contemporary organisations, for leadership of this sort is "characterised by an avoidance of direct controntation between the leader and work group" and leaders "avoid interaction that make evident power and status differentials" (Jacobs, 1971). Social exchange implies that people will be willing to devote extensive effort to their employing organisations if they feel they are receiving appropriate and equitable benefits in return. "The leader is required to persuade others that behaving in a desired fashion is in their own self-interests, which they evaluate primarily through data and logic. Obviously, in order to persuade employees that desired behaviour is in their own self-interests, the leader must know how the particular employees think, what they value and what excites them and interests them about their work or job"(Intriligator, 1983).

In stressing the need for leaders to know the orientations of employees, we see the parallels to the sociology of the workplace approach envisaged by Titon. However, a question mark still remains over whether it is sufficient to identify the benaviours of "effective" leaders (even if incorporating both sexes) unless we return to the issue raised by the critical theorists of what "effectiveness" --and hence power--is being used for, and in whose ultimate interests. It is not enough to have more women in positions of leadership, or even a different concept of "effective leadership" if the bulk of women teachers still experience differentials in the amount of day-to-day power they can exercise in the school, and if little attention is paid to the overall socio-political structure in which schools and teachers operate (including gender imbalances in such power structures). The notion of economic bargaining may be appealing in management terms, but it may not finally be a fair exchange if the traders start from different capital bases.

Marcuse's concept of "surplus repression" is a valuable one here: while all countries need an amount of "socially useful repression" to contain individual desires, "surplus repression" is "that portion which is the result of specific soietal conditions sustained in the interests of domination" (Marcuse, 1964). Just as the surplus of value from work accrues to the owners of the means of production, surplus--or unnecessary--repression, embodied in the ethos and practices that characterise school, workplace and family, serves to ensure psychological acceptance of servitude. While Marcuse was talking of class domination, it might be argued that women in particular suffer "surplus repression"--in this case in the interests of male supremacy. Certainly the literature on female deviance and female conformity shows girls and women "over-controlled" through child-rearing practices, educational institutions, law enforcement agencies and religious doctrines (Davies, 1984). This is another reason to be hesitant about social exchange theories of management. If all that women teachers have to offer in terms of attractions to management is compliance and hard work, then a bargaining model may in the end merely confirm women in supporting roles. An interesting question would be whether societies exercising surplus repression in domestic terms also have fewer women in decision-making capacities in education. The point is that it is essential to

examine management theories in the social and cultural context in which they are first generated, then accepted and finally exercised in educational institutions. It would be foolhardy to attempt an international theory of educational "leadership" without recognition of the existing power dimensions among those being "led." Hence the need for empirical, country-based research.

The Pilot Survey

The first part of our project to explore women in educational administration in the Third World was to begin to document the existing research, literature and statistics on the relative positions of women in teaching in Third World countries (see Davies, 1986). Then came the design of a research instrument which could provide qualitative information on the attitudes and perceptions of teachers and Heads themselves in various countries. A pilot questionnaire was devised and distributed from which we are beginning to get preliminary returns, and which will generate the form of the next stage research instruments. While the numbers are at present small (162 teachers), lopsided (106 men and 56 women) and from two countries only (Ghana and Sierra Leone), it may be of interest to indicate the trends so far emerging--and the reasons why the whole "questionnaire" may need a thorough redesign.

We asked questions to elicit sex differences in three main interlocking areas: the perceptual (ambitions, career planning, job satisfaction and performance); the domestic (family and marriage commitments); the organisational (responsibilities in school, mentoring and leadership). As no claims to generalisability are being made at present, the findings will be presented very badly and without any serious statistics.

Firstly, men teachers and male Heads appear at first sight to be more "ambitious" than their female counterparts. Whether they are aiming inside or outside the teaching profession, men would like jobs of higher status and/or remuneration than would women. Half the male Heads were going to be Director of Education, but none of the female Heads. Only men wrote phrases like "eminent educationist" or "to reach the top." In terms of planning a career, half the male Heads opposed to a quarter of the female Heads said they had planned their career from the start. The classroom teachers showed fewer sex differences, most indicating that they evaluated their career as they went along rather than planning from the beginning.

In terms of job performance and satisfaction, there were at first sight few discernible sex differences. Unsurprisingly, teachers felt they did best the things they liked best, and the things they liked best revolved around the actual pedagogic role--imparting knowledge, explaining, problem-solving, discussion and practical work. There was then more variety within a sex than between the sexes: teachers and Heads of both sexes would either like or dislike marking, like or dislike extra-curricular activities, like or dislike preparation of lessons.

Perhaps the most telling sex difference was in response to the question "What aspects of your job do you do least well?", where only male teachers and male Heads firmly stated "nil" or "none." This fits in with the literature showing women more likely to identify their own weaknesses (Hennig and Jardin, 1978). Again, because of our masculinist terminology, such differences have been described as men being "more confident" or women "lacking confidence;" what happens when we say women are "less arrogant?" It certainly has implications for any assertiveness training. Similarly, rather than reiterating the usual cry that women are "less ambitious," it might be equally fruitful to denote men as "more pushy." A study of women's orientations should act to cast doubts on the achievement obsession of our contemporary world, and question whether "goal-directedness" or the ego-tripping "confidence" are always the universal goods that we proclaim. It is essential that gender-inclusive research in educational administration does not start from the male-as-norm principle and unsurprisingly confirm what it is that women "lack;" instead it should begin to value as positive the realistic and insightful attitudes that women may have towards self and career. We might even describe men as lacking the skills of self-analysis and being neurotic about power. Apparently women do have long-term visions, but they bear in mind that others will have expectations of them. The research shows that they tend to inquire as to the long-range consequences of social decisions rather than short-range technical economic gains. Men, as a group, on the other hand, are "bearers of the Western industrial society's techno-economic rationality in which economic goals are permitted to legalize exploitation or disregard other human beings" (UNITAR 1979). While critical theory has located such "rationality" as derived from the needs of the modern capitalist State, it is crucial to recall that the ideology may not be evenly spread throughout a population, and that women may provide the best source for resistance to exploitative uni-directional goal-setting. Hence the design, language and interpretation of questionnaires tackling issues of teachers' goals and ambitions will have to be very carefully done; ours is still fraught with dangers and unexplicated assumptions, and will need much revision.

The perceptual area clearly overlaps with the second area, the personal/domestic, particularly when exploring the reasons for entering teaching. Out of the 17 possible reasons, the top three for both sexes in Ghana and for men teachers in Sierra Leone were "Enjoyed actual teaching process", "Wanted intellectual stimulation" and "Academic subject interest." This fits with the finding that teachers of both sexes enjoyed the same things about their job. However, female teachers in both countries also gave "Best career for married person" a high priority, which no sierra Leone men and only two Ghanaain men did. The top three reasons for Sierra Leone women were "Enjoyed contact with children," "Working conditions" (hours, holidays, etc.) and "Enjoyed actual teaching process." The picture of a more child--or family--oriented female teacher is confirmed by the questions relating to home responsibilities. Women teachers were more likely to have to go home immediately after school to be with children or relatives; and they spent more hours per week on domestic tasks. Yet interestingly, female Heads also spent more time on domestic tasks than did their male counterparts, the same average amount of time as the female class teacher. It would appear that domestic commitments do not necessarily hold

women back, but presumably require greater skill at time management--or simply harder work all round. It must be noted, too, that the sex differences in amount of labour were not vast, and that many men also had problems doing school work at home, or experienced difficulty going out in the evenings or weekends to attend school functions.

A greater involvement by females in their family life is a traditional and obvious "cause" of female underachievement in promotion; yet again it might be preferable to see this as a positive strength than a handicap. Naturally, any feminist would want to see a more equitable division of labour and responsibility in the home; but for many cultures this would hardly be achieved overnight. Instead I shall be arguing that management training ought to assume a level of domestic responsibility, and should work from there, rather than forcing women--and even men--into covering up their personal commitments or feeling guilty about them as "interference." We have for too long accepted the Weberian bureaucratic notion of efficiency being achieved through sharp divisions and role specialisation, by commitment to the organisation having somehow to take automatic precedence over commitment to family. This is the western-derived, classic "modernity" theory of role fragmentation: the more modern a country, the more segmented it was supposed to be, to avoid corruption and spillage between the various functions. (A sharply bounded senior management role was, of course, also predicated on the male assumption of a 40 hour plus working week with a non-working spouse at home.) Yet while not advocating a return to nepotism or moonlighting, it is time to acknowledge the multiple roles that we all play in our everyday lives. We will teach and administer more effectively if we are not made to feel defensive or despairing about our other identities, but rather see them as normal and even contributory to our school life and work. The parent who successfully raises four children and organises a household has many pedagogic and managerial skills at their disposal; yet we rarely acknowledge this, still less give increments or promotion points for child-rearing.

The third area--the organisational--again raises questions about responsibilities, but this time within the school. Respondents were asked which of a list of various school tasks it would be preferable to allot to men, to women, or to either sex. There were some predictable sexual divisions, with men being seen as preferable for boys' welfare and boys' discipline, and female teachers for girls' welfare and discipline; otherwise areas such as the supervision of probationers, cover for absent staff, INSET, school visits, careers advice and examination administration were more likely to be allocated to either sex than to one sex in particular. However, there were some interesting exceptions. Males were likely to be seen as preferable for the timetable, for curriculum development and for the organisation of special events. Females were chosen for hospitality and for pupils' personal problems. Sometimes Heads were equally divided between the three categories--male, female, either--but there was not one job in the school that some Head did not think better done by one sex or the other. No male Heads thought women would be better at the timetable. Interestingly, male teachers in Ghana were more inclined to give all the duties to themselves. We begin to see not only some preconceptions about male "organisational" roles and female 'caring' roles,

but also a suspicion that females might get fewer opportunities for anticipatory socialisation into some of the basic administrative functions of a school.

A question on mentoring revealed further that three-quarters of the male Heads had been encouraged by their Principal to apply for promotion, as opposed to only a quarter of the female Heads. When asked about preference for male or female Heads, the majority of the teachers said it did not matter; but if they did make a choice, it was more likely to be male (29 male headship choices, 3 female headship choices). The tendency was that those who already had a woman Principal indicated that it did not matter what sex of leader they had; those with a male Head were equally likely to state a male preference. Familiarity with a female leader certainly does not breed contempt, but an apparent realisation that leadership can be open to both sexes; familiarity with a male leader may merely confirm headship as an appropriate masculine role.

It still seems important to break the vicious circle whereby females are not seen as equally competent at organisational or managerial skills, therefore are given fewer opportunities to demonstrate and practise them, therefore receive less mentoring from superiors within the school, and therefore provide fewer role models for women or examples of management for men.

Management Models

Differences between countries which have already emerged, taken with a phenomenological analysis which insists on the primacy of the social and power context of a school, may mean that it is extravagant to attempt any global recommendations for a management model which will be both gender-inclusive and culturally acceptable. Nonetheless, some broad imperatives suggest themselves. Those management analyses which have been concerned about gender imbalances have generally started from a normative view of the effective manager and probed how far women approximated to the model. Were they equally high scoring on "initiation structure" and "consideration structure?" Were they sufficiently career-oriented, assertive, forceful? This investigation has suggested that we are asking the wrong questions. Instead of asking why more women are not reaching the top, we should be asking fundamental questions about the nature of, or even the need for a "top." Progress has been made in moving on from biological to socialisational and then to organisational "constraints" on women, but all these still constitute victim analysis rather than concept analysis. They focus on the deficits of women and leave unrealised a deeper critique of those activities women are supposedly constrained from doing.

We must not be fooled by the language of existing managerial definitions. Leaving aside the obvious issue that in most management texts for both developed and developing countries the manager is still referred to as exclusively male, there are deeper questions. "The principles underlying the organisation of schools are not different from those applicable to a commercial undertaking" writes Paisey (1984). "The purpose of management is the organisation of resources (including manpower) to produce the optimum result." Reducing teachers (whether manpower or womanpower) to the level of 'resources' is a typically dehumanising--and one might submit masculinist--approach.

The reason why so many educational innovations fail is because teachers refuse to see themselves as mere intermediaries for the achievement of national goals. Until we encourage all teachers to identify their own requirements from work; until we sort out any gender, race, social class or other structural differences in these requirements or in the likelihood of their being met; until management is seen primarily as a coordinatory and not a control activity, we are unlikely to see the growing industry of educational management as anything but a means to hinder national objectives such as self-reliance, growth or, indeed, equality.

It is no mere semantic shift that has led to the word "administration" being gradually replaced by "management" in educational literature and training. "Management" reflects not only a suitably scientific and commercial ethos, but also encapsulates the people-control function in a way 'administration' never did. If management as currently conceived is primarily about control, then our interest should not lie in having more women in control. Our interest should be in power sharing rather than power acquisition. It should be in collaboration rather than domination--however scientifically masked as "decision-centralisation." There is no point in switching to women oppressing men, still less to women oppressing other women.

From the survey we find sex differences in "ambition"--so let us reappraise our acceptance of ambition, drive, upward mobility and our traditional concepts of "career development." We find sex differences in the extent of "dual roles" experienced by teachers - so let us incorporate the implication of that dual role in or management training. We find gender categorization among teachers and Heads in terms of suitability for organisational tasks and for "leadership" --so let us insist that any management theory should take into account staff definitions of each other and acknowledge the existing and socially constructed imbalances in whose definitions prevail in any organisation. Rather than "harmonising" or "rationalising" or even "neutering" our staff, we do better to use conflicts and differences as a source of creative tension and productive critique.

Holistic Management

A gender-inclusive model of educational management therefore points to a very different orientation in our thinking and training. It is what I shall term "holistic management," and it is holistic in two ways. Firstly it includes the whole staff; and secondly it includes the whole person. Hackneyed phrases perhaps; but it's curious how, in educational management terms, they have been hitherto ignored. In its borrowing from industrial and corporate settings, educational management appears to forget one crucial and obvious difference: unlike car assembly workers, all teachers are themselves people managers. Their clientele may be younger, rougher and less sophisticated; but the principles of classroom management are no different from organisational or personnel management in general. Successful classroom interaction is by nature about decision-making, goal setting, communication, negotiation, bargaining, delegation, participation and time management, about identifying power interests and networks of allegiance among pupils. And yet we appear to have arrived at the position whereby a mystique has been erected around educational "leadership"

and only the controllers, or potential controllers, are selected for "management training." A privileged secrecy and a jargon surrounds the "techniques" which they learn. There is a strange anomaly that the administrator is taken out of the classroom, even out of the staffroom, and then has to be sent on courses to relearn "communication skills" and "participation techniques." They even have to undergo courses on "human relations." What other sorts of relations are there? This is not to argue against specialist or advanced training in certain areas, or indeed against rewards and incentives, but to posit that school management is the one field which should not be a specialism or a highly rewarded field of expertise. Otherwise management training for Heads becomes a question of "to them that hath shall be given."

It is my contention then that all teachers, from the beginning, should receive management training. If there are indeed gender (or ethnic or social class) differences in those who are sponsored for educational management, then the obvious solution is to open up the field to everyone and expose the top-down, "expert" role for the elitist, quasi-masonic cadre that it is. There are indeed skills to be learned, techniques to explore, research to be read; but education is the one field where these should be available to every member of the workforce. It is curious that we can construct whole edifices to train Heads to manage, without equivalent courses for the rest of the staff on how to be managed, let alone appreciate for themselves the transmission of management skills.

A joint training has immediate implications. It would point to a less hierarchical, more collaborative and possibly rotational administrative operation in schools. If management is conceived as a set of skills masterable by everyone, it undermines the notion that only men make "natural" leaders, and it reduces the possibility that women will not have the chance at anticipatory socialisation and the practising of administrative functions. The accountability ideology which is taking hold once more could be effectively fulfilled through job appraisal and self-evaluation by teachers, rather than measuring teachers against an agreed set of performance standards (drawn up, if in Britain, by 87% male administrators). While "appraisal" goes on continuously in schools, it is essential to make this overt and equitable, not covert and partial. Some managers find it difficult to offer criticism to a woman, and so either avoid commenting on shortfalls in performance or unconsciously use different standards when assessing women (MSC, 1983). For appraisal to be equally beneficial, it must be under the control of the teacher concerned. In an interesting appraisal scheme in one secondary school in UK, everything--who does the appraising, what aspects of the teacher's work were appraised, whether there should be a written report, and whether it should be used for references--is decided by the teacher. The staff committee have drawn up a long and detailed questionnaire to help teachers focus their thinking. It covers achievement so far, professional skills development, curriculum development, administration, approach to classroom teaching, ambitions and prospects, extra-curricular activities and relationships with colleagues and parents. Such appraisal will also include comments on the management team in terms of how much support, opportunity or constraint they provide (TES, 15.3.85). Whilst such a scheme was not, of course, designed specifically in the interest of gender

equity, it would seem a radical step forward in the provision of an "educative" environment for all staff. Most management training manuals stress that appraisal requires training; and if teachers are going to conduct their own appraisal, there is even more reason to provide a universal pre-service management education.

The immediate cry will be that developing countries in particular cannot afford management training for all teachers; yet this is not proposed as an addition, but as a substantive replacement on any basic course of teacher training. Rather than tackling the "disciplines"--philosophy or history of education--at ground level and leaving management to future specialists, it makes more sense to make management compulsory in basic training and leave the luxury of reflective theorising to later advanced or in-service courses. Just as compulsory maths and science up to age 16 in the USSR has helped produce a healthy proportion of female technicians and engineers, so compulsory management might help redress the gender differentials among those deemed suitable for management tasks.

The second aspect of holistic management is the personal one. In arguing for concrete recognition of all the roles that we play, this is more than just the traditional human relations style of management--which can be equally manipulative in its benevolent patronage. Newer approaches to time management take the view that a person's home commitments--as well as leisure pursuits, social life and personal development--are not potential "problems" to be "made allowances for," but are vital aspects of all our life goals, and as such should be accorded the respect and the same "planning" that may go into purely work commitments. One of the potential hazards for the aspiring female is the attempt to become Superwoman: staving off guilt feelings about not fulfilling either of her dual roles properly by attempting single-handed perfectionism in both. A time management training, on the other hand, will replace the rising panic with a set of identifiable and attainable directions for both professional and private life, and develop the capacity to prioritize day-to-day tasks in order to remain in control of these directions. It teaches delegation where necessary in any context; the ability and the right to say "no" without fearing loss of esteem; making tasks measurable, with deadlines if that helps; identifying networks of support or possible barriers to achievement. Above all, it reminds us that we all <u>need</u> a private life to function effectively at work. Stress and fatigue are caused not by the things we have done, but by the thought of things we have not done--whether at home or in the classroom. When both teachers and Heads acknowledge that "effective" management is not necessarily about "born leadership" or dedicated graft (requiring a supportive wife?) it will again remove the mystique and make for more equitable communications. It encourages men, too, to think about their long-term personal and family commitments, and how much time should be actively allotted to these. Either sex needs to be aware that "delegation" does not read "exploitation."

This may sound like the advocacy of a return to a somewhat mechanistic management-by-objectives; but the differences are that we are talking about <u>self</u>-management, and about the <u>whole</u> self in its social context--not just a set of work tasks in someone else's interests. This explains why I prefer the term

"directions" to "goals"--for goals have the tendency to become inflexible and to justify any means or any sacrifice of others to achieve them. The research on sex differences in perception and use of time is significant here. Women's time is summarised as "organic", "unsold" and "coordinated;" men's is "one-dimensional," "sold" and "segregated." Women tend not to measure their time in quantitative ways but value it in qualitative terms; they alternate various activities and often do several things at the same time. For men, time is sold time, with visible rewards or wages spelling out what work is worth; attention is concentrated on one task (Pietila, 1984). Thus I would differ with many of the time management courses in their insistence on clearly drawn boundaries between work development and personal development, on only being able to do one thing at a time. Instead I would build on capabilities to function in a co-ordinated and integrated fashion.

Where I concur with the time management literature is the encouragement to do the planning exercises collaboratively with other people. An important section of our listed directions should have to do with what are currently called "strokes"--the attention which one gets from or gives to another person. Positive strokes--praise, gratitude, encouragement, promotion--make us feel happy and important; negative strokes--criticism, ridicule, putdowns--make us feel ill at ease; but no strokes at all is the worst form of mental torture. Management techniques have long acknowledged the need for recognition for all workers--with teachers as no exception; but the suspicion that women teachers may receive fewer strokes from Principals or colleagues indicates the need for something more systematic than the cheery greeting in the corridor. In co-educational schools, women are given fewer "status" tasks, are marginalised (and even subject to sexist putdowns), and receive less encouragement for promotion (Reich and La Fountaine, 1982; Singhal, 1984). In addition, the literature on interaction socially and in meetings indicates women giving more strokes than receiving them, that is, providing supportive comments, listening attentively, being interrupted more, acceding conversational rights and asking interested questions (Spender, 1980).

Management training should therefore firstly encourage the individual to list out directly the positive and negative strokes they receive within their work and home contexts, and analyse whether the overall balance would explain any "loser" behaviour. It should also alert everyone to keep a check on when they last intimated to someone that they appreciated them, and why. A goal of sufficient strokes for all those deserving of them could be part of time management. While tabulating in a formal way the number of strokes given may seem an incredibly mechanistic way of managing human relationships, it might give some indication of whether particular categories of people in an organisation, such as males or females, superiors or subordinates, are receiving more or less than their fair share of recognition.

In singling out the themes of time management and recognition, I have tried merely to identify examples within a holistic management training which gender-focussed research would indicate as relevant. An ethnic, regional or social-class based research design may elicit different recommendations; it must be recognised that different patterns of inequality may posit different

management ideologies. The main criterion for any useful theory of educational administration is that it be reflexive enough to spotlight its own biases and to self-destruct when necessary.

Conclusion

A focus on gender in educational administration at present seems to turn everything on its head. The "logic" of research and model-building has to be reversed. The traditional method for arriving at an analysis of schools has been what one might term the "highest common multiple" approach: beginning at the sacred pinnacle and engaging in the normative "how far" technique. How far can we apply commercial or public sector management to schools? How far can we apply western models to developing countries? How far can we control people in order to achieve political goals? How far do certain groups like women approximate to the "normal" model of effective management? How far can we change women to achieve within this model?

Instead we begin at the lowest common denominator, at the ground or profane level, and ask "what" questions. What do people bring to an organisation? What power bases do they operate from and what are their existing relationships? What are their common needs and what might be their different objectives and requirements from work? What kind of management model would enable the answers to these questions to be logged and projected into a continuous dialectic with the overall objectives for an education system?

A theory of educational administration, like any social theory, contains two features: an explanation of why people act in the way they do, and a set of prescriptions for how they ought to act. This paper has argued the necessity for a structural explanation of why power has come to be exercised in certain ways in schools, with, in this instance, the structural analysis relating both to the overall control function of education and to the peculiarly male-derived forms and language through which this control is mediated. It has argued that the very practice or conceptualising of educational administration itself may act to consolidate repression and to deskill the mass of teachers, unless attention is paid to embedded and unequitable features of educational organisations such as gender. "Paying attention" to gender in researching teachers' attitudes to their organisational life in two developing countries has led in this instance to prescriptions for "holistic management." A gender-inclusive theory would also be a power-inclusive theory, which would point to the need for a common managerial training for all school personnel. Power differentials are not reduced by having alternative operators of power, or even new styles of "leadership," but by everyone having access to the skills which promote control over one's personal environment. The inclusion of gender concerns in educational administration is not advocated merely to benefit women, but in order to generate a critical methodology which would provide greater flexibility and potential for both men and women--and as both teachers and learners.

Bibliography

Bates, R. "Towards a Critical Practice of Educational Administration" Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration Studies in Educational Administration, No. 27, 1982.

Bates, R. (ed.) Educational Administration and the Management of Knowledge, Australia: Deakin University, 1983.

Davies, L. Pupil Power: Deviance and Gender in School, Falmer, 1984.

Davies, L. "Women, Educational Management and the Third World: A Comparative Framework for Analysis" International Journal of Educational Development, Vol. 6, No. 1, 1986.

Greenfield, T. "Organisations as Social Inventions: Rethinking Assumptions about Change" Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, Vol. 9(5), pp. 551-574, 1973.

Greenfield, T. "Reflections on Organisational Theory and the Truths of Irreconcilable Realities" Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 14(2), pp. 1-73, 1978.

Henig, M. and Jardim, A. The Managerial Woman, New York: Pocket Books, 1978.

Intriligator, B. "Leadership Theory Revisited" Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, vol. 3(1), pp. 5-17, 1983.

Jacobs, T. Leadership and Exchange in Formal Organisations Human Resources Research Organisation, 1971.

Marcuse, H. One Dimensional Man Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964.

MSC No Barriers Here? A Guide to Career Development Issues in the Employment of Women, UK: Manpower Services Commission, 1983.

Paisey, A. School Management: A Case Approach Harper and Row, 1984.

Pietila, H. "Women as an Alternative Culture Here and Now" Development 4, 1984.

Reich, C. and La Fountaine, H. "The Effects of Sex on Careers within Education: Implications for a Plan of Action" Canadian Journal of Education Vol. 7(2), pp. 64-84, 1984.

Singhal, S. "The Development of Educated Women in India: reflections of a social psychologist" Comparative Education, Vol. 20(3), pp. 355-370, 1984.

Spender, D. "Talking in Class" in Spender, D. and Sarah, E. (eds) Learning to Lose: Sexism and Education, London: The Women's Press, 1980.

Tipton, B. "Educational Organisations as Workplaces" British Journal of Sociology of Education, Vol. 6(1), 1985.

UNITAR Women and Technology in the Industrialised Countries Science and Technology Working Papers Series No. 8, UN Institute for Training and Research, 1979.

Watkins, P. "Scientific Management and Critical Theory in Educational Administration" in Bates, R. op cit., 1983.